



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

m-2

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,158	04/19/2004	Christopher J. Hall	FSP0050	2709
29586	7590	12/04/2006	EXAMINER	
FSP LLC P.O. BOX 890 VANCOUVER, WA 98666			MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/827,158	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HALL, CHRISTOPHER J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Elmira Mehrmanesh	<b>Art Unit</b> 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

The application of Hall, for an "Error handling scheme for time-critical processing environments" filed April 19, 2004, has been examined.

Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 USC § 102.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,871,350).

As per claim 1, Wong discloses a method in a data processing device (col. 2, lines 40-45) comprising: directing commands to device driver logic to a jump table, the jump table directing the commands to device driver command processing logic (col. 4, lines 52-62) and Fig. 3

as a result of detecting a device error (col. 5, lines 57-62), reconfiguring the jump table to return without invoking the command processing logic and in a manner that

indicates that the commands were successfully carried out (Fig. 4).

As per claim 2, Wong discloses the driver logic is display driver logic (col. 4, lines 34-40).

As per claim 3, Wong discloses continuing to provide commands to the driver logic after detection of the error, the commands to configure a display frame (col. 6, lines 27-34) the provider of the commands acting to correct the error; and as a result of the correcting of the error, reconfiguring the jump table to again direct commands to the command processing logic (col. 6, lines 35-46).

As per claim 4, Wong discloses the jump table comprised by a thunk layer between the caller and the driver logic (Fig. 2).

As per claim 5, Wong discloses a memory (Fig. 1) suitable for use by a data processing device (col. 2, lines 40-45), comprising: logic to direct commands to device driver logic to a jump table, the jump table directing the commands to device driver command processing logic (col. 4, lines 52-62) and Fig. 3

and logic to, as a result of detecting a device error (col. 5, lines 57-62), reconfigure the jump table to return without invoking the command processing logic and in a manner that indicates that the commands were successfully carried out (Fig. 4).

As per claim 6, Wong discloses the driver logic is display driver logic (col. 4, lines 34-40).

As per claim 7, Wong discloses logic to reconfigure the jump table to again invoke the command processing logic in response to correction of the error (col. 6, lines 27-46).

As per claim 8, Wong discloses the jump table comprised by a thunk layer between the caller and the driver logic (Fig. 2).

As per claim 9, Wong discloses a method comprising: as a result of detecting an error (col. 5, lines 57-62), reconfiguring command routing logic for device driver logic so that command processing logic of the device driver is not invoked and to return from commands in a manner indicative of successful completion of command processing (Fig. 4).

As per claim 10, Wong discloses reconfiguring a thunk layer between application logic and driver logic to return from commands without invoking driver command processing logic (col. 5, lines 64-67 through col. 6, lines 1-6) and Fig. 3.

As per claim 11, Wong discloses as a result of correction of the error, reconfiguring the command routing logic to invoke command processing logic of the driver logic in response to commands (col. 6, lines 27-46).

### **Related Prior Art**

The following prior art is considered to be pertinent to applicant's invention, but nor relied upon for claim analysis conducted above.

Fulk (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,576), "Method and apparatus for using device drivers of a first operating system, under the control of a second operating system".

Fedotov et al. (U.S. PG PUB No. 20040181796), "Real-time collaboration client".

Mealey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,822), "System for modifying functions of static device driver using a registered driver extension extended dynamically by providing an entry point for the driver extension".

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571) 272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Robert W. Brunsell*  
EXAMINER  
UNIT 1/10/2009  
UNIT 1/10/2009